

1. Scope of Code Revision. To what extent should the Land Development Code (“LDC”) be revised? Options include:

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| Option A | Adopt a new Land Development Code, consisting of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. A new Land Development Code (text) and Zoning Map, to take effect concurrently; orii. A new Land Development Code (text) only, with the effective date deferred until Council adopts a new Zoning Map. |
| Option B | Adopt a limited set of amendments to the existing Land Development Code, targeting improvements in one or more policy areas. |

Answer: Option A(i).

Additional Direction: The land development code should be rewritten and remapped as soon as possible. Concrete code and map changes should be made in 2019 to make the city more affordable, transit-friendly, and environmentally sustainable. We recognize that all the work that needs to be completed on our code cannot all be done and perfected in a single year. Therefore, for major changes to be made in 2019, the Manager and Council should prioritize “all types of homes for all kinds of people in all parts of town” (our Strategic Housing Blueprint goals) and a development pattern that supports 50/50 Transportation Mode Share by 2039.

The 2019 rewrite/map effort should ensure that the housing capacity for the City is significantly increased so that we can meet our goals in the Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint and (draft) Austin Strategic Mobility Plan in the timelines detailed in the plans through a housing-focused approach. This should include reforms in the code so that we can meet the City’s goals for the Imagine Austin Growth Concept Map’s Activity Centers and Corridors, and for Missing Middle, and ADUs. Preventing housing shortages, creating income restricted housing for working class people, legalizing less expensive forms of housing, and creating mixed-income & transit-friendly areas are urgent actions for Council to take.

Votes should be taken in 2019 to implement such changes-- with a focus on reforming the areas outlined in the Manager’s memo-- while other priorities may be addressed by future votes after 2019 if they are not able to be addressed in 2019. We recognize future planning efforts will also be necessary after 2019 to further implement necessary reforms.

Additional policy direction on how to achieve the objectives of Option A(i).

- The Manager should have the LDC Revision and zoning map ready for Council action on First Reading in October of this year (the Planning Commission having already issued its report).

- The new zoning map should start with the third draft zoning map developed through the CodeNEXT process, with revisions consistent with new policy direction provided by the Council in this document.

2. Housing Capacity. To what extent should the Land Development Code provide for additional housing capacity in order to achieve the 135,000 additional housing units recommended by the Strategic Housing Blueprint? Options include:

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| Option A | Maintain the level of housing capacity provided by current Code (i.e., approximately 145,000 new units); |
| Option B | Provide a level of housing capacity comparable to Draft 3 of CodeNEXT (i.e., approximately 287,000 new units); or |
| Option C | Provide greater housing capacity than Draft 3, through enhanced measures to allow construction of additional residential units. |

Answer: Option C.

Additional Direction: The rewrite/map should enable all kinds of homes in all parts of town for all kinds of people and must help us meet the goals in the Austin Strategic Housing Blueprint. The code should be a tool for equity and fair housing. In order to write an equitable code, we must prioritize the City’s goal of integration while also reducing gentrification and displacement. We recognize that citywide housing capacity is an important step toward addressing these issues, but is not enough alone. We stay committed to using city dollars to subsidize low-income housing, expanding our affordable housing bonus programs, and creating market-rate housing for the middle class through expanding missing middle housing. Key ASHB goals (pg. 16) relevant to the land development code are:

- 135,000 units in 10 years- Current zoning capacity will not allow us to reach our goals. If we do not achieve 135,000 units of housing built, Austin risks becoming even more expensive and exclusive. To reach a forecast of 135,000 housing units built, experts have testified to Council that housing capacity must be two to three times our forecast goal. Others have suggested an even greater capacity is necessary to reach our goals. We recognize that future planning after 2019 can also add capacity, income restricted units, and more missing middle housing.
- At least 75% of new housing units should be within 1/2 mile of Imagine Austin Activity Centers and Corridors, focusing on the Transit Priority Network.
- At least 30% of new housing should be a range of housing types from small-lot single family to eight-plexes to help address Austin’s need for middle-class housing and multi-generational housing. Code Next versions 1-3 fell far short of reaching this goal. As stated in staff’s memo: “The Draft 3 map largely perpetuate[d] existing zoning patterns that significantly limit the availability of missing middle housing.”

- At least 25% of new low-income/affordable housing should be in high opportunity areas—we should attempt to create more income-restricted housing than Code Next V1-3 offered, especially in high opportunity areas where housing subsidies do not produce, relatively, as many units, and density bonuses should be properly calibrated.

CodeNEXT version 3 left the majority of housing capacity in lower opportunity areas and the vast majority outside the urban core. A new code should be more equitable and transit-supportive than version 3. Changing our code can prevent needless sprawl, impervious cover, and environmental damage, and can address equity. Housing capacity changes should be mapped to reduce sprawl and displacement, not accelerate either.

In 2019, the rewrite/map should make substantial reforms to our rules to create enough housing capacity in Activity Centers, Corridors, and Transition Zones to allow us to meet our ASHB and ASMP goals, while maximizing income-restricted housing and mitigating for displacement and gentrification, and be accurately modeled to ensure goals can be met. Corridor and transition zone regulations should be accurately and carefully modeled so that Council and community discussions can be based on policy rather than technicalities.

We should use UT's Gentrification Study map to carefully zone corridors and transition zones in areas that are gentrifying and are susceptible to gentrification to reduce further displacement. We should implement the proposal in the Draft 3 process to not provide extra entitlements on existing, older multifamily properties unless substantial increases in long-term, income-restricted housing units can be achieved. The Planning Commission began the process of using the Gentrification Study Map to create different intensities of corridors, and we support that effort. We should attempt to create density bonuses to reach 15,000 new affordable units in higher opportunity areas; this requires more income restricted housing zoned capacity than 15,000 in capacity.

Additional policy direction on how to achieve the objectives of Option C:

- The proposed land development code and zoning map should provide for greater housing capacity through code revisions to:
 - Reduce parking requirements (as suggested in the answer to question 5, below).
 - Reduce site development standards for missing middle housing options in order to facilitate development of additional units.
 - Revise non-zoning regulations for parcels within activity centers or fronting corridors so as to allow higher housing unit yields by prioritizing among non-zoning regulations only right-of-way acquisition, traffic mitigation and transportation demand management, drainage, and water quality.
 - Map transition areas to provide additional missing middle housing consistent with policy direction for Compatibility (as suggested in the answer to question 4, below).

Key Goals (<http://assets.austintexas.gov/austincouncilforum/E3-20180209183337.pdf>) :

- Page 2, Bullet Points 1, 6, 7, and 9;
- Page 3, Bullet Point 2;
- Page 4, Bullet Points 6 and 10; and
- Page 5, Bullet Point 6.

3. Missing Middle Housing Types. To what extent should the Land Development Code encourage more “missing-middle” housing types, such as duplexes, multiplexes, townhomes, cottage courts, and accessory dwelling units? Options include:

- | | |
|-----------------|--|
| Option A | Maintain the range of housing types provided for by the current Land Development Code; |
| Option B | Provide for a range of housing types comparable to Draft 3; or |
| Option C | Provide for a greater range of housing types than Draft 3. |

Answer: Option C.

Additional Direction: Missing middle housing and ADUs are a good way to create family-friendly housing in our existing neighborhoods. More diverse housing types will provide housing for middle class families and help reduce create options for working people to stay in their neighborhoods. The rewrite/map should change regulations to create transition zones that set Austin up to achieve the ASHB 10-year goal of 30% of new housing units built being missing middle housing, especially near community resources, such as schools (to create diverse school populations), health facilities, parks, transit, etc. CodeNEXT fell short of reaching these goals.

ADUs are a vital tool for adding reasonably priced housing in neighborhoods that have become too expensive for young families, and they can help households to stay in their homes. The rewrite/map should allow external and internal/attached ADUs of all types to be more easily created in all residential zones, as stated in the ASHB. The rewrite should also liberalize the types of housing that are acceptable as ADUS, potentially including tiny homes on wheels, Airstreams, modular homes, 3D-printed homes, etc.

Additional policy direction on how to achieve the objectives of Option C:

- The proposed land development code and zoning map should provide for greater missing middle housing capacity through revisions that:
 - Reduce parking requirements (as suggested in the answer to question 5, below).
 - Reduce site development standards for missing middle housing options in order to facilitate development of additional units.

- Map transition areas to provide additional missing middle housing consistent with policy direction for Compatibility (as suggested in the answer to question 4, below).
- Map additional parcels for missing middle housing, including creating larger transition zones, if Council can craft general, context sensitive criteria that will provide sufficient direction to staff. Increasing opportunities for missing middle housing, in any event, will be a continuing goal for future district level planning efforts as suggested at the end of this document.

Key Goals (<http://assets.austintexas.gov/austincouncilforum/E3-20180209183337.pdf>):

- Page 2, Bullet Points 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, and 9;
- Page 3, Bullet Point 3;
- Page 5, Bullet Point 6.

4. Compatibility Standards. To what extent should the City’s “compatibility standards” (i.e., rules limiting development near residential properties) be modified to provide additional opportunities for development?

- | | |
|-----------------|---|
| Option A | Maintain compatibility standards comparable to those in the current Land Development Code; |
| Option B | Reduce the impact of compatibility standards on development to a degree consistent with changes proposed in Draft 3; or |
| Option C | Reduce the impact of compatibility standards on development to a greater degree than Draft 3. |

Answer: Option B or Option C.

Additional Direction: See answers to Questions 2 and 3. Compatibility standards in the Code should be set to enable the City to reach its housing and mobility goals. The effects of compatibility standards on housing capacity should be accurately measured. These metrics could be reached through remapping or through code modifications, or both. We are open to our colleagues continued input on how to make sure compatibility rules help us reach our collective goals.

Additional policy direction on how to achieve the objectives of Option B or Option C.

Compatibility standards and initial mapping should work together in a way that maximizes the amount of potential housing units achievable for parcels on transportation corridors and within activity centers under those parcels’ base zoning and with any Affordable Housing Bonus otherwise available.

- Maintain compatibility standards, as in the third code draft developed through the CodeNEXT process, triggered by a Residential House-Scale zoning district of an adjacent property or a property located directly across an alley or narrow neighborhood street (60 feet or less).
- Require sufficient no-build zones and vegetative buffers, as in the third code draft developed through the CodeNEXT process, between residential and commercial uses so as to minimize the impact of noise and light pollution, deliveries and trash collection, as well as providing ecological services for trees, habitat, and green storm water controls.
- Maximize housing capacity on transportation corridors through mapping to eliminate the impact of compatibility on the corridor-facing property:
 - If the housing unit yield of a deep lot located directly on a transportation corridor is significantly impacted by compatibility, then the back portion of the lot should be initially mapped with a zone (e.g., RM1 and above) that does not trigger compatibility for the front portion.
 - A shallow lot located directly on a transportation corridor should have the lot located directly behind or across an alley or narrow neighborhood street initially mapped with a zone (RM1 and above) that does not trigger compatibility for the shallow lot and is in scale with any adjacent residential house-scale zones.
 - Mapping of additional parcels for missing middle housing and larger transition zones should be provided for in a new map if Council can craft general, context sensitive criteria that will provide sufficient direction to staff. Increasing opportunities for missing middle housing, in any event, will be a continuing goal for future district level planning efforts as suggested at the end of this document.

Key Goals (<http://assets.austintexas.gov/austincouncilforum/E3-20180209183337.pdf>):

- Page 2, Bullet Points 1, 5, and 7;
- Page 3, Bullet Point 11;
- Page 4, Bullet Point 6; and
- Page 5, Bullet Point 6.

5. Parking Requirements. To what extent should the City’s minimum parking requirements be modified to provide additional opportunities for development and/or encourage transit options consistent with the Imagine Austin comprehensive plan?

Option A Maintain minimum parking requirements comparable to those established in the current Land Development Code;

Option B Reduce the impact of minimum parking requirements on development to the same degree as Draft 3; or

Option C Reduce the impact of minimum parking requirements on development to a greater degree than Draft 3.
--

Answer: Option C.

Additional Direction: The rewrite/map should create a more transit-supportive, multimodal, and accessible Austin. This includes right-sizing future parking supply, but also many other Austin Strategic Mobility Plan goals that will support transit options. As laid out in the memo, excess parking harms housing affordability, transit, and the environment. Key ASMP goals relevant to the land development code are:

- Support shift to 50/50 Transportation Mode Share by 2039
- Promote transit-supportive densities along the Transit Priority Network, especially near bus stops. Persons per acre goals on corridors should be set to achieve transit goals.
- Increase the number of people living and working within a ½-mile of All Ages and Abilities bicycle facilities
- Create complete and connected communities
- Decrease vehicle miles traveled
- Right-size future parking supply

Additional policy direction on how to achieve the objectives of Option C.

- The proposed land development code (LDC) should reduce the impact of minimum parking requirements on development to a greater degree than in the third draft developed through the CodeNEXT process in areas that are within ¼ mile of activity centers, corridors, and transit stations with high frequency service.
- The proposed land development code should recognize, if possible, that one size may not best fit all when it comes to parking and apply different standards for areas that may have contextual factors that suggest different parking standards, such as areas with narrow streets and no sidewalks, and areas around urban schools. Given the timelines suggested in the answer to question 1 above, general context sensitive standards may need to be broad at this time with refinement determined through future district level planning efforts as suggested at the end of this document.
- The proposed land development code should consider requirements and standards for parking that allow parking structures to evolve over time as transportation patterns change, including designs for structured parking that allow conversion to residential or commercial uses as parking needs change.
- The proposed land development code should ensure ADA compliant parking is provided as necessary for all large residential and commercial projects, even where parking is not otherwise required.

Key Goals <http://assets.austintexas.gov/austincouncilforum/E3-20180209183337.pdf>:

- Page 2, Bullet Point 7;
- Page 4, Bullet Points 3 and 7; and
- Page 5, Bullet Points 4 and 6.

Additional Direction for Future Planning Efforts

The Manager should layout a more robust and intentional planning process going forward to meet the goals of Imagine Austin, the ASHB and ASMP, and other strategic priorities.

Not all of the work that is necessary to meet our goals can be accomplished this year nor can all our goals be met through the land development code alone. It is not necessary to achieve all our goals this year since development will take place over a longer time-frame.

In order to plan for additional housing capacity that is not initially achieved by adopting an initial new code and zoning map, the Manager should develop recommendations to the Council for accelerating the development of district-level plans (on a geographic scale such as East Riverside Corridor, North Burnet Gateway, or Station Area Plans, etc) for areas in our city susceptible to change, such as Imagine Austin Activity Centers and Corridors, with specific goals for each plan related to the ASMP and ASHB.

Planning for all Activity Centers and Corridors should be completed (and/or existing district plans updated) within 5 years, so as to ensure that ASMP and ASHB goals are able to be met. The Council recognizes that additional resources will be required to achieve this scale of planning in this time frame, and the use of consultants should be considered to allow for multiple district-level plans to be developed concurrently in order to meet this timeline.

Planning should not only seek to achieve ASHB and ASMP goals, but other Council priorities, such as regional storm water and water quality planning, parkland accessibility, utility infrastructure, walkability and connectivity, and other policy priorities associated with complete communities.

Planning should include robust engagement of adjacent stakeholders, but also include participation from across our city, as all parts of Austin have an interest in each part of Austin contributing equitably to our goals being met.

A new Land Development Code alone cannot stop gentrification and displacement, so the Council and the Manager should continue to advance and expedite implementation of the most constructive and impactful recommendations outside of the land development code that have been recommended by the Anti-Displacement Task Force and other similar efforts.

Key Goals (<http://assets.austintexas.gov/austincouncilforum/E3-20180209183337.pdf>):

- Page 2, Bullet Points 1 and 8;

- [Page 3, Bullet Points 7, 8, and 9;](#)
- [Page 4, Bullet Points 5 and 7; and](#)
- [Page 5, Bullet Point 6.](#)

SUMMARY: In 2019, we need to vote to change our overall policies so that our corridors, centers, and transition zones, missing middle housing, and ADU policies put us on track to meet our housing and transportation goals listed above. This will help us create a more affordable, equitable, transit-friendly, and sustainable city.